

November 12, 2012

Dear Honorable Judge Young,

My name is Sonja Dedrick, I am writing you in hopes that you can give me an understanding of how can the prosecutor actually prove a chain of evidence in regards to my husbands Calvin Dedrick's case, especially with the specific allegations brought against persons who handled evidence in this case.

Also based on interviews of supervisors and chemist conducted by the state police, during their investigation of the drug lab, it would be highly unlikely that the prosecutor can definitively determine the chain of evidence, or whether she (Annie Dookhan) was primary or secondary chemist on the samples in question.

There is no way to determine if Annie Dookhan came in contact before or after Della Saunders. Based on Della Saunders' statements during her interview with the state police, (paragraph 3) she stated "she never saw anything out of the ordinary. Everything checked out when she confirmed Annie Dookhan's work But Della was not in the same room as Annie. Which means that Annie Dookhan may have done anything without Della's knowledge?

Can the prosecutor prove that Annie Dookhan didn't go into the evidence safe and tamper with these samples before they were assigned to Della Saunders? If you refer to Annie Dookhan's own testimony in her interview with the state police, (paragraph 2) she admits that " she was at fault and responsible for the 90 samples that she removed from the evidence room in June 2011, she admits that the samples were not properly assigned to her, not entered into the computer by an evidence officer, and not entered into the evidence log book. So it's actually a likely probability that Annie Dookhan did indeed tamper with the samples before they were assigned to anyone.

Based on the interview conducted by the state police of Annie Dookhan, her co workers, supervisors and people who were in charge of the facility, Annie Dookhan wasn't only capable to run a-muck in this facility, but when she did make drastic mistakes, she was able to go back and fix them without being reprimanded.

I understand that this situation has the potential to allow many violent felons to be released back into society; and it's your job to makes sure future violent crimes are not committed. Your Honor, if you were to check my husband's record you will find that he has no violence on his record. If you were to examine his charges, you'd find his criminal record highly overstates his criminal history.

By law anything that Annie Dookhan came in contact with should be in question. If it's in question, then no drug charge should stand unless they can prove beyond a reasonable doubt that she didn't tamper with those samples. Which is highly unlikely based on her statements and her co-workers statements during the investigation.

Furthermore, based on the fact that samples in my husband's case were re-tested before his trial, the prosecutors had to have had knowledge before hand about the situation at the drug lab. This means that the prosecutor withheld vital evidence from the court and from the defense, which should allow Calvin a new trial.

Therefore, I believe based on the speech you so eloquently gave to the jury involved in Calvin's trial about the Constitution and their duty to up hold it, if the prosecutor would have informed you about this very serious matter and not withheld this information you would have not allowed this to go to trial before some sort of investigation.

Your Honor, there are still some questionable issues from Calvin's trial " the vehicle stop, SGT Terestre's handling of the reports at the Franks Hearing, major issue arising with said rouge drug lab chemist, Annie

Dookhan falsifying and tampering with evidence in this case and many others. Your Honor I don't claim to be a lawyer or know much about the law but it appears that the prosecutors involved in this case are just making things up as this trial moves along. Now I received a copy of a motion from the prosecutor I guess it's a response to the motion Mr. Grossberg submitted stating that the samples from the 3 controlled buys never made it to the lab to be tested. "They would have us believe that the three samples just sat there for 2 years. After Office Terestre clearly states in his sworn affidavit **three times** they were logged and sent to the State Lab to be analysis. If he did **3 uninterrupted surveillances on 3 different days**, I can see if one sample sat there in the drug depository and didn't make it to the lab **but all three samples** not making it to the lab. Your Honor I thank you for taking the time to read this letter as his family members we have major concerns about the things we are hearing.

1. Office Terestre writing one thing in an affidavit and saying something different on the stand example he observed 9 Brinsley Street from Gibson St which happens to be on the other side of Dorchester.
2. Then he gives a poor excuses as to why he falsified the information in his report. As you stated yourself your honor what he said **"flat out makes no sense at all"**
3. He clearly states that he sent the samples from the controlled buys to the State Lab and this is why he was able to get a warrant for 9 Brinsley Street and the prosecutors look into the chain of custody to find that the same samples that officer Terestre used to secure his warrant were "supposed" to have never been tested. And all of this is only coming to light because of the scandal at the state lab.
4. Sir I am only a hard working mother trying to make sense of this situation, I don't understand how I can read an affidavit written in support of trying to seek a warrant "written by officer Terestre". As I read it my sister is reading another affidavit written by the same officer one year earlier about another person that he used this informant **Mizz** to arrest and both affidavits are the same just different names vehicles and addresses. Then when further research is done on this it was discovered that there are several other duplicate affidavits on other surveillances that read the same. Please explain to me **"if"** you did surveillance on different individuals years apart how can everything happen the same way. I can understand if the first paragraph if you're given a description of yourself but once you start to get into the details that happen shouldn't all the reports be different.

Now to sum everything up Honorable Judge Young my family just wants to know the answers to some of these concerns we have. I was under the impression that an officer is sworn to uphold the law. And be truthful because they are held to a higher standard. But they appear to make things up and change things around to benefit them. Judge can they really come back after 2 years and simply state they never had the samples tested. Then why is Calvin Dedrick sitting in Wyatt Detention Center. He would have graduated from school by now sir.

It is not a secret that his family wants him home; but at least Calvin should be afforded a new trial based on all the allegations and questionable issues from his trial.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to read this letter and taking it onto consideration.

Psalms 142 verse 7

God Bless

Sincerely

Sonja Dedrick